

REMARKS

The present response amends claims 1 and 6 and requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the recitations "smooth" and "substantially compressed". The present response deletes "smooth", which is a claim-broadening amendment.

It is submitted that the specification clearly indicates what is meant by the term "substantially compressed":

For the purpose of the present application, a pressure such that the substrate is not substantially compressed is a pressure where the average thickness of the substrate is reduced by less than 10% of its original value.

A process where the substrate is not substantially compressed includes any process where the substrate is locally compressed by more than 10%, but wherein the average thickness of the substrate is reduced by less than 10% of its original value. Such local compression can occur when a special pattern is applied to the substrate in the step where heat and pressure are applied to the substrate.

Page 3, lines 17-23.

Accordingly, the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter can be determined and withdrawal of the rejections is requested. See *W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, at 316 (CAFC 1983).

Claim 6 is amended herein to change "a" to "an" for grammatical reasons, without altering the scope of the claim thereby.

2. Claims 1- 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable based on Hsu, in view of Chen, Cooley and/or Steele. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In each rejection the primary reference is Hsu.

Hsu (US 6,120,717) is directed to a process for making a wood composition board (e.g., hardboard). See, for example, column 1, lines 10-13., column 3, lines 30-36.

In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to a process for coating a reconstituted wood substrate (e.g. hardboard). See, e.g., claim 1 and page 1, line 15 to page 2, line 2.

It is, thus, submitted that it is appropriate to withdraw the rejections of the claims, since Hsu's process for making e.g., hardboard is completely different from the claimed process of coating e.g., hardboard. See, e.g., claim 1 of the present application and Hsu's col. 1, ll. 20-40, and col. 3, ll. 40-50. As a result of these differences, Hsu would not lead a skilled artisan to the claimed invention.

The secondary references do not require detailed discussion, since they do not provide the disclosure lacking in the primary reference, Hsu. Additionally, it is submitted that these secondary references do not make obvious the claimed invention, neither taken alone nor in combination with other references.

Respectfully submitted,



Lainie E. Parker
Reg. No. 36,123
Attorney for Applicant

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5466